BLANK PAGE

FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
OCT 9 1940
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1940.

No. 9.

THE SCHRIBER-SCHROTH COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,
Respondents.

No. 10.

THE ABERDEEN MOTOR SUPPLY COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,
Respondents.

No. 11.

THE F. E. ROWE SALES CO.,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,
Respondents.

PETITIONERS' REPLY BRIEF MAKING REFERENCE TO ADDITIONAL RECORD PAGES.

JOHN H. BRUNINGA,
JOHN H. SUTHERLAND,
Attorneys for Petitioners.

October 7, 1940.

St. Louis Law Printing Co., 415 North Eighth Street. CEntral 4477.

BLANK PAGE

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1940.

No. 9.

THE SCHRIBER-SCHROTH COMPANY,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,

Respondents.

No. 10.

THE ABERDEEN MOTOR SUPPLY COMPANY,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,

Respondents.

No. 11.

THE F. E. ROWE SALES CO.,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE CLEVELAND TRUST COMPANY,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,

Respondents.

PETITIONERS' REPLY BRIEF MAKING REFERENCE TO ADDITIONAL RECORD PAGES.

This Reply Brief, filed pursuant to the Stipulation dated June 19, 1940, is filed for the purpose of designating the pages of the Record to which Petitioners may refer in a further Reply Brief to be filed before the hearing, or to

which Respondents may refer at the hearing; and is filed at this time so as to permit the Clerk to proceed with the printing of a condensed and reduced record.

1. Respondents' Brief asserts that the accused piston, Exhibit 1, has a structure and mode of operation to secure a definite result. Petitioners may refer to the following additional citations to the Record:

124, 125-6, 127, 128-9, 223, 261-262, 529-30, 582, 586-7, 1026-7, 1031, 1036-8, 1049, 1056-7.

2. Respondents' Brief asserts that the piston of the Jardine patent has a structure and mode of operation to secure a definite result. Petitioners may refer to the following additional citations to the Record:

72, 73-76, 95, 136-7, 138-140, 141-144, 157-8, 169-73, 173-5, 192, 196-7, 199-200, 229-231, 232, 244-5, 551-2, 1026-7.

3. Respondents' Brief asserts that the piston of the Jardine patent went into extensive commercial use. Petitioners may refer to the following additional citations to the Record:

131-2, 181, 190, 224-5, 225-6.

4. Respondents' Brief challenges the proof with respect to the existence, utility, structure and mode of operation of the Long pistons, so that it becomes necessary to include the evidence anent the same in toto; and Petitioners may refer to the following additional citations to the Record:

343-471, 490-92, 537, 557-8, 567-8, 651-699, 927-9, 937-41, 985-7, 994-8, 1440-1446, 1585-1646, 1667-69, 1727-38.

5. Respondents' Brief challenges the utility of and the srtucture and mode of operation of the Franquist, Schmiedeknecht, Ricardo, Gulick, Hartog, and Pomeroy pistons. Petitioners may refer to the following additional citations to the Record:

145-6, 203-4, 221-2, 226-7, 263, 496, 506-7, 529, 545, 573-4, 1363-4.

6. Corrections: Record Page 2208, referred to at page 7, Petitioners' main Brief, should be 2108. Record Page 178, referred to in Petitioners' main Brief, page 27, should be Record Page 190.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN H. BRUNINGA
JOHN H. SUTHERLAND,
Attorneys for Petitioners.

October 7, 1940.